REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 17, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-11, 13-27 and 29-35 are rejected to by the Examiner. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-11, 13-27 and 29-35 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 14, 17-19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,433,470 to Watanabe et al. (hereinafter "Watanabe"). Claims 15, 16, 24-27, 29, 30 and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,274,977 to Pyun et al. (hereinafter "Pyun"). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,072,270 to Hu et al. (hereinafter "Hu"). Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pyun in view of Pyun and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,639,346 to Bae et al. (hereinafter "Bae"). Claims 1, 4-6, 8-11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Bae. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Bae and further in view of Pyun. Claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe in view of Bae and further in view of Hu.

The rejection of claims 14, 17-19, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 14 is allowable over the cited references in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, "wherein the panel satisfies the following condition $1.5 \leq (Rxs/Ryc) \leq 3.3$". Watanabe does not teach or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention.

DC:50388466.1

The Examiner states that Watanabe teaches Rxs/Ryc = 1.1, but this is outside the claimed range. (See column 14, lines 53-65.) This claimed range is taught in paragraph 0049 and Table 1 where embodiments 5-7 are mentioned as satisfying certain characterisitcs. Accordingly claim 14 and claims 17-19 and 21-23, which depend from claim 14, are allowable over Watanabe. Further, claims 15-16 and 20 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 14 because Pyun or Hu, singly or in combination with Watanabe, do not cure the deficiencies of Watanabe.

The rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 8-11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, "wherein the panel satisfies the following condition $1.5 \leq (Rxs/Ryc) \leq 3.3$". None of the cited references including Watanabe and Bae, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly claim 1 and claims 4-6, 8-11, and 13, which depend from claim 14, are allowable over Watanabe and Bae. Further, claims 2-3 and 7 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1 because Pyun or Hu, singly or in combination with Watanabe, do not cure the deficiencies of Watanabe.

The rejection of claims 24-27, 29-30, and 32-35 under U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 24 is allowable over the cited references in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, "wherein the panel satisfies the following condition $0.22*Zd \leq Z(d/2) \leq 0.26*Zd$, wherein $Z(d/2)$ is height difference between a point on the inner surface of the panel at the central point and a point on the inner surface of the panel half way between the central point and the corner of the effective area of the panel". None of the cited references including Watanabe and Pyun, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

The Examiner agrees that Pyun does not specifically state the values for the $Z(y/2)$, $Z(x/2)$, and $Z(d/2)$. The Examiner then goes on and states:

> Watanabe teaches a panel wherein Rxs/Ryc - 1.1 (see col. 14, lines 53-65). Watanabe teaches that the panel has a value for Ryc that is between 1.3R and 3.3R (col. 9, lines 6-23) and a value for Rxs that is between 1.8r and 5.8R (col. 10, lines 32-33). Watanabe teaches that by providing the panel with such radii of curvature an improved feeling of flatness and improved drop strength can be attained (col. 15, lines 50-54). Applying the radii of curvature Ryc, Rxc, and Rdc taught by Watanabe and the values of Zy, Zx, and Zd taught by Pyun, the combined invention teaches $0.22Zd \le Z(d/2) \le 0.26Zd$, $0.21Zy \le Z(y/2) \le 0.25Zy$, and $0.23Zx \le Z(x/2) \le 0.27Zx$. (See Office Action p. 4)

Watanabe does not teach anywhere the values $Z(y/2)$, $Z(x/2)$, and $Z(d/2)$. In response to this fact the Examiner identifies a number if different parameters and their values and then concludes that: "Applying the radii of curvature Ryc, Rxc, and Rdc taught by Watanabe and the values of Zy, Zx, and Zd taught by Pyun, the combined invention teaches $0.22Zd \le Z(d/2) \le 0.26Zd$, $0.21Zy \le Z(y/2) \le 0.25Zy$, and $0.23Zx \le Z(x/2) \le 0.27Zx$." The Examiner does not provide any analysis or mathematic basis for this conclusion, but rather just states it as fact. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to more clearly show analytical or mathematical support for this assertion. Therefore Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has not shown that this feature of the present invention is suggested or taught by Watanabe and Pyun. Accordingly claim 24 and claims 25-27, 29-30, and 32-35, which depend from claim 24, are allowable over Watanabe. Further, claim 31 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 24 because Bae, singly or in combination with Watanabe or Pyun, do not cure the deficiencies of Watanabe and Pyun.

In the Other Prior Art Cited section of the Office Action the Examiner states the U.S. Patent No. 5,107,999 to Canevazzi "reads on claims 1 and 14, teaching Rxs/Ryc = 1.8 (See Fig. 3 and table II)." The Examiner appears to be equating R_L with Rxs and R_Y with Ryc. These are

different measures. Rxs and Ryc are the inner radii of curvature of the a flat screen cathode ray tube. R_L and R_Y are outer radii of curvature of a curved screen cathode ray tube. Therefore, Canevazzi does not read on claims 1 and 14.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 17, 2006   By _Valerie P. Hayes_ Reg. No. 53,005

                                     for **Eric J. Nuss**
                                      Registration No. 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

different measures. Rxs and Ryc are the inner radii of curvature of the a flat screen cathode ray tube. R_L and R_Y are outer radii of curvature of a curved screen cathode ray tube. Therefore, Canevazzi does not read on claims 1 and 14.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 17, 2006   By Valerie P. Hayes Reg. No. 53,005
                                                     ᶠᵒʳ **Eric J. Nuss**
                                                          Registration No. 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant

DC:50388466.1